10-3-3 41

RCE & 1771

PTO/SB/30 (08-03)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Request For Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal

Address to:
Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Application Number	09/532,395
Filing Date	3/22/2000
First Named Inventor	WARD, GREGORY
Art Unit	1771
Examiner Name	PRATT, CHRISTOPHER
Attorney Docket Number	

This is a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 of the above-identified application.
Request for Continued Examination (RCE) practice under 37 CFR 1.114 does not apply to any utility or plant application filed prior to June 8, 1995, or to any design application. See Instruction Sheet for RCEs (not to be submitted to the USPTO) on page 2.

1. Submission required under 37 CFR 1.114 Note: If the RCE is proper, any previously filed unentered amendments and amendments enclosed with the RCE will be entered in the order in which they were filed unless applicant instructs otherwise. If applicant does not wish to have any previously filed unentered amendment(s) entered, applicant must request non-entry of such amendment(s).

RECEIVED
OCT 10 2003
GROUP 1700

a. [X] Previously submitted. If a final Office action is outstanding, any amendments filed after the final Office action may be considered as a submission even if this box is not checked.

i. [ ] Consider the arguments in the Appeal Brief or Rely Brief previously filed on _____

ii. [ ] Other _____

b. [X] Enclosed

I. [X] Amendment/Reply

ii. [X] Affidavit(s)/ Declaration(s)

iii. [ ] Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

iv. [ ] Other _____

2. Miscellaneous

a. [ ] Suspension of action on the above-identified application is requested under 37 CFR 1.103(c) for a period of _____ months. (Period of suspension shall not exceed 3 months; Fee under 37 CFR 1.17(i) required)

b. [ ] Other _____

3. Fees

The RCE fee under 37 CFR 1.17(e) is required by 37 CFR 1.114 when the RCE is filed.

a. [ ] The Director is hereby authorized to charge the following fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. _____

i. [X] RCE fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(e)

ii. [ ] Extension of time fee (37 CFR 1.136 and 1.17)

iii. [ ] Other _____

b. [ ] Check in the amount of $ _____ enclosed

c. [X] Payment by credit card (Form PTO-2038 enclosed)

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT REQUIRED

Name (Print/Type)	GREGORY F. WARD	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	
Signature		Date	9/25/03

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Name (Print/Type)	GREGORY F. WARD		
Signature		Date	9/30/03

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.114. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

10/08/2003 SSITHIB1 00000063 09532395

01 FC:2801 375.00 OP

PTO/SB/17 (08-03)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2003

Effective 01/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT ($) 375-

Complete if Known	
Application Number	09/532,395
Filing Date	3/22/2000
First Named Inventor	WARD, GREGORY
Examiner Name	PRATT, CHRISTOPHER
Art Unit	1771
Attorney Docket No.	

METHOD OF PAYMENT *(check all that apply)*

☐ Check ☒ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ Other ☐ None

☐ Deposit Account:

Deposit Account Number

Deposit Account Name

The Director is authorized to: *(check all that apply)*

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☐ Credit any overpayments

☐ Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, **except for the filing fee** to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING FEE

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1001	750	2001	375	Utility filing fee	
1002	330	2002	165	Design filing fee	
1003	520	2003	260	Plant filing fee	
1004	750	2004	375	Reissue filing fee	
1005	160	2005	80	Provisional filing fee	

SUBTOTAL (1) ($)

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

		Extra Claims	Fee from below	Fee Paid
Total Claims	-20** =		X	=
Independent Claims	- 3** =		X	=
Multiple Dependent				=

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20
1201	84	2201	42	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	280	2203	140	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204	84	2204	42	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2) ($)

***or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above*

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification	
1812	2,520	1812	2,520	For filing a request for *ex parte* reexamination	
1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251	110	2251	55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252	410	2252	205	Extension for reply within second month	
1253	930	2253	465	Extension for reply within third month	
1254	1,450	2254	725	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255	1,970	2255	985	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401	320	2401	160	Notice of Appeal	
1402	320	2402	160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
1403	280	2403	140	Request for oral hearing	
1451	1,510	1451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452	110	2452	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453	1,300	2453	650	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501	1,300	2501	650	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502	470	2502	235	Design issue fee	
1503	630	2503	315	Plant issue fee	
1460	130	1460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809	750	2809	375	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
1810	750	2810	375	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
1801	750	2801	375	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	375
1802	900	1802	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify) _____

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) ($) 375

SUBMITTED BY				(Complete *(if applicable)*)	
Name *(Print/Type)*	GREGORY F. WARD	Registration No. *(Attorney/Agent)*		Telephone	770-321-9823
Signature				Date	9-30-03

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS **ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PTO/SB/17 (08-03)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2003

Effective 01/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

☒ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT ($) 375-

Complete if Known	
Application Number	09/532,395
Filing Date	3/22/2000
First Named Inventor	WARD, GREGORY
Examiner Name	PRATT, CHRISTOPHER
Art Unit	1771
Attorney Docket No.	

METHOD OF PAYMENT *(check all that apply)*

☐ Check ☒ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ Other ☐ None

☐ Deposit Account:

Deposit Account Number

Deposit Account Name

The Director is authorized to: *(check all that apply)*

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☐ Credit any overpayments

☐ Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, **except for the filing fee** to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING FEE

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1001	750	2001	375	Utility filing fee	
1002	330	2002	165	Design filing fee	
1003	520	2003	260	Plant filing fee	
1004	750	2004	375	Reissue filing fee	
1005	160	2005	80	Provisional filing fee	

SUBTOTAL (1) ($)

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

		Extra Claims		Fee from below	Fee Paid
Total Claims		-20** =		X	=
Independent Claims		- 3** =		X	=
Multiple Dependent					=

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20
1201	84	2201	42	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	280	2203	140	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204	84	2204	42	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2) ($)

**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification	
1812	2,520	1812	2,520	For filing a request for *ex parte* reexamination	
1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251	110	2251	55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252	410	2252	205	Extension for reply within second month	
1253	930	2253	465	Extension for reply within third month	
1254	1,450	2254	725	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255	1,970	2255	985	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401	320	2401	160	Notice of Appeal	
1402	320	2402	160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
1403	280	2403	140	Request for oral hearing	
1451	1,510	1451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452	110	2452	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453	1,300	2453	650	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501	1,300	2501	650	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502	470	2502	235	Design issue fee	
1503	630	2503	315	Plant issue fee	
1460	130	1460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809	750	2809	375	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
1810	750	2810	375	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
1801	750	2801	375	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	375
1802	900	1802	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify) _____

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) ($) 375

SUBMITTED BY

(Complete *(if applicable)*)

Name *(Print/Type)*	GREGORY F. WARD	Registration No. *(Attorney/Agent)*		Telephone	770-521-9823
Signature				Date	9-30-03

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PTO/SB/21 (08-03)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/532,395
Filing Date	3/22/2000
First Named Inventor	WARD, GREGORY F.
Art Unit	1771
Examiner Name	PRATT, CHRISTOPHER
Attorney Docket Number	

Total Number of Pages in This Submission: 20

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- [X] Fee Transmittal Form
- [ ] Fee Attached
- [X] Amendment/Reply
  - [X] After Final
  - [ ] Affidavits/declaration(s)
- [ ] Extension of Time Request
- [ ] Express Abandonment Request
- [ ] Information Disclosure Statement
- [ ] Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- [ ] Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
  - [ ] Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53
- [ ] Drawing(s)
- [ ] Licensing-related Papers
- [ ] Petition
- [ ] Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- [ ] Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- [ ] Terminal Disclaimer
- [ ] Request for Refund
- [ ] CD, Number of CD(s) _____
- [ ] After Allowance communication to Group
- [ ] Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- [ ] Appeal Communication to Group **(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)**
- [ ] Proprietary Information
- [ ] Status Letter
- [X] Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below): RETURN POST CARD

Remarks

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	GREGORY F. WARD
Signature	
Date	9/24/03

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name	GREGORY F. WARD		
Signature		Date	9/30/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant Ward, Gregory F.

Serial No. 09/532,395 (Divisional of 08/613,336 Parent now Patent 6,051,177)

Filed: 03/22/2000

For: Thermo-Mechanical Modification Of Nonwoven Webs

Art Unit: 1771

Examiner: Pratt, Christopher C.

REQUEST FOR CONTINUING EXAMINATION
AND
AFTER FINAL AMENDMENTS IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED 8/27/2002

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

1. Applicant respectfully wishes to traverse the basis for the Examiner's reasons for rejecting Applicant's prior response as not persuasive of patentability for reasons set forth below. Please also refer to the Applicant's contention at Examiner's point 8 below that the Final Rejection on the Second Office Action was premature and should be withdrawn

3. The applicant respectfully wishes to traverse the rejections of Claims 10 through 18 under 35 USC § 112 for indefiniteness as follows: Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection "that the applicant was not in the possession of the invention was filed". Per the MPEP 2163-II.A.(3a). An adequate written description of the invention by any description of sufficient, relevant identifying characteristics so long as a person in the art would recognize that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See Purdue Pharma LPV v. Faulding Inc., 56USPQ2dat 1481,1483.

Applicant asserts that the written description of the invention, which includes the drawings and data tables, adequately describes each rejected claim. This is evidenced by several adjudicated instances. For example an applicant may show possession of an invention by disclosure of drawings... that are sufficiently detailed to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention as a whole See Vas Cath, 19USPQ at 1118 ("drawings alone may provide a "written description of an invention as required by Sec112\". See also Autogiro Co. V United States, 384F.2d 391, 398 ("in those instances where a visual representation can flesh out words, drawings may be used in the same manner and with the same limitations as the specifications").

In addition, it is important to note that the parent application was issued as US Patent 6,051,177 indicating that the written description of the invention, which includes the drawings and data tables, adequately described each rejected claim.

5. Please cancel Claims 10 through 18 and substitute Claims 19 through 27 as follows:

19. A nonwoven web having elastic properties in the cross-machine direction wherein the anisotropic precursor web consists essentially of thermally bonded thermoplastic and non-thermoplastic fibers, said nonwoven web containing from 60 to 100% thermoplastic fibers and the remainder non-thermoplastic fibers, said precursor web being continuously drawn within a web heating means by a multiplicity of drawing means wherein the heated web is subjected to a variable tension means sufficient to provide a strain rate of at least 3.5 in./in./minute but equal to or less than 8 in./in./minute, said strain rate calculated based on the apparent gage length between individual elements of said tension means, whereby the resultant web is characterized by a narrowing of its lateral dimension, an increase in its length, an increase in web thickness and the development of a web elasticity of at least 85% recovery after being elongated at least 50% in the direction perpendicular to and in the same plane as the drawing forces.

20. The nonwoven web of Claim 19 wherein the thermoplastic fibers are selected from the group consisting of polyolefins, polyesters, polyamides, and their respective copolymers.

21. The nonwoven web of Claim 19 wherein said non-thermoplastic fibers are selected from the group consisting of natural cellulosics, regenerated cellulosics, natural fibers, glass, inorganic fibers and metallic fibers.

22. The web of claim 19 wherein said precursor web is laminated to a thermoplastic elastomeric film.

23. The nonwoven web of Claim 19 wherein said precursor web is a thermally bonded laminate or composite consisting of two or more thermoplastic webs selected from the group consisting of spunbonded nonwovens, meltblown nonwovens, thermally bonded carded nonwovens, thermoplastic foams and thermoplastic films.

24. A nonwoven web having elastic properties in the machine direction wherein the anisotropic precursor web consists essentially of thermally bonded thermoplastic and nonthermoplastic fibers, said nonwoven web containing from 60 to 100% thermoplastic fibers and the remainder nonthermoplastic fibers, said precursor web being continuously drawn within a web heating means by a multiplicity of drawing means wherein the heated web is subjected to a variable tension means sufficient to provide a strain rate of at least 3.5 in./in./minute but equal to or less than 8 in./in./minute, said strain rate calculated based on the apparent gage length between individual elements of said tension means, whereby the resultant web is characterized by a reduction of its length dimension, an increase in its lateral dimension, an increase in web thickness and the development of a web elasticity of at least 85% recovery after being elongated at least 50% in the direction perpendicular to and in the same plane as the drawing forces.

25. The nonwoven web of Claim 24 wherein said thermoplastic fibers are selected from the group consisting of polyolefins, polyesters, polyamides, and their respective copolymers.

26. The nonwoven web of Claim 24 where said nonthermoplastic fibers are selected from the group consisting and natural cellulosics, regenerated cellulosics, natural fibers, glass, inorganic fibers or metallic fibers.

27. The nonwoven web of Claim 24 where the precursor web is a thermally bonded laminate comprising two or more thermoplastic webs selected from the group including spunbonded nonwovens, meltblown nonwovens, thermally bonded carded nonwovens, thermoplastic foams and thermoplastic films.

7. Traverse Of The Examiner's Assertion That The Webs Produced By The Teachings Of The Instant Application Are The Same As Those Of Hassenboehler

Claims 10-18 Were Rejected As Obvious Under 35 USC 103(a). The applicant respectfully traverses the objection that the webs produced by the teachings of the instant application are the same as those of Hassenboehler. This traverse considers several factors which the Applicant asserts are strong evidence that the products claimed are substantially different from those of Hassenboehler:

1. The instant Application teaches the use of a significantly lower strain rate Hassenboehler's '482. The reason for Applicant's claims to lower strain rate is that low strain rates impart a high degree of elasticity as well as rapid return to original length after being elongated. The elasticity differences as indicated in the Critical Difference table below indicate a different web morphology than Hassenboehler due to the low strain rates taught by the instant application. Additional evidence that webs produced by the instant Application have a

different morphology than Hassenboehler due to the low strain rates taught by the instant application is demonstrated by comparing the high increases in the filtration efficiency of Hassenboehler Table III, Column 3, lines 36 to 46 due to reduction in the web pore size and distribution after processing between the un-drawn sample (draw ratio of 1) and the drawn webs with draw ratios ranging from 1.5 to 2.5 . The product webs of the instant application have no significant reduction in the web pore size and distribution after processing as shown in Table 4 of the instant Application. This is a result of the lower strain rate of the present invention compared to the extremely high rates taught by Hassenboehler's '482 and strongly indicates that significant differences exist in the morphology of web products prepared using low strain rates taught by the instant application, and thus differentiates between Hassenboehler and the instant Application.

2. Examiner asserts that the use of low strain rates (less than 10 inches per inch per minute) of the instant application would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art. The applicant traverses this assertion on the grounds that a person, including Hassenboehler, having ordinary skill in the art did not teach, use or claim strain rates below 10 in./in./minute. The Examiner incorrectly asserts that using a reduced strain rate would have been motivated by "the desire to optimize the filtration properties of the web". In fact Hassenboehler teaches a preferred strain rate of 20 to 200 in./in./minute and a best mode strain rate of 30 to 60 in./in./minute. If Hassenboehler, having ordinary skill in the art, would have recognized the

path to the optimization was through lowering the strain rates, he would have taught and claimed those rates claimed in the instant Application but he did not. The applicant, however, is not seeking improved filtration efficiency but is seeking improved elasticity performance.

Applicant asserts that the specification of the instant application's shows that there is no significant change in pore size due to the processing. This is because the fabric is not as disrupted by the instant application's low shear rate processing compared to Hassenboehler 5,244,482. The changes in filtration efficiency are negligible as shown by Table 4 from Page 14 of the instant application.

Table 4

Change in Liquid Filtration Efficiency Before And After Thermomechanical Processing

Sample	Web Type	Fiber Type	Basis Weight	Filtration Efficiency Before	Filtration Efficiency After
			GM/Sq M	%	%
1	MB	100% PP	60	85	85
2	TB	70%PP/30%Rayon	30	35	36
3	SB	100% PP	30	33	33*
4	SB	100% Nylon	45	41	43
5	SB	100% PP	100	37	37
6	SB	100% PET	24	33	33
7	MB	100% PET	75	81	81
8	TB	65% PET/ 35% Rayon	24	35	37
9	SB	100% PP	18	18	18
10	SB/PU	100% PP/100% PU Film	32	N/A	N/A

SB = Spunbond, MB = Meltblown, TB = Carded and Thermally Bonded
PU = Polyurethane film, PP = Polypropylene, PET = Polyester

* Corrected data point

The Examiner's assertion that the above Table 4 shows at least one instance (example 6) of a substantial change in filtration efficiency i.e. 33 to 3. In this case the data was incorrectly stated and should have been 33 to 33 . Even if the efficiency change was 33 to 3 it would have been in the wrong direction to the teachings of Hassenboehler.

Now examining Hassenboehler's 5,244,482 Table III Column 15, lines 38-47; this data shows as the draw ratio (a measure of shear rate) increases that there is a profound increase in filtration efficiency due to changes in the pore size and pore size distribution.

Applicant asserts that the specification of the instant application's shows that there is no significant change in pore size due to the processing. This is because the fabric is not as disrupted by the instant application's low shear rate processing compared to Hassenboehler 5,244,482. The changes in filtration efficiency are negligible as shown by Table 4 from Page 14 of the instant application.

The only conclusion that can be made is that the webs produced by the low shear rates taught by the instant application had little or no change in pore size and are fundamentally different structures with different morphology and therefore patently different over Hassenboehler's.

CRITICAL DIFFERENCES IN STRAIN RATES BETWEEN THE INSTANT APPLICATION AND HASSENBOEHLER'S '482 AS THEY AFFECT ELASTIC RECOVERY

Applicant submits the following Declaration under CFR 37 1.132 declaring a critical difference between the Hassenboehler strain rates of greater than about 10 inches per inch per minute and the instant application's strain rates of less than about 8 inches per inch per minute.

DECLARATION OF GREGORY F. WARD

A critical difference exists between the Hassenboehler strain rates of greater than about inches per inch per minute and the instant application's strain rates of less than about 10 inches per inch per minute. This difference is shown in the following table.

Elastic Recovery After 50% Elongation
For Various Strain Rates On A 30GSM PP Spunbond

Strain Rate inches/inch/min.	Recovery 10 seconds	Recovery 300 seconds	Difference 10-300 sec.
	(%)	(%)	seconds
3	96	97	1
4	95	96	1
5	95	96	1
6	95	96	1
7	94	95	1
8	93	95	2
9	88	94	6
10	80	90	10
11	78	89	11
12	76	88	12
13	74	87	13
14	70	85	15
15	68	84	16
16	67	83	16
17	65	82	17
18	63	81	18
25	57	75	18
30	52	71	19

The data show a sharp break in the 10 and 300 second rate of recovery in the area of strain rates of greater than about 10 inches per inch per minute which indicates the difference between the wbs produced by the instant application and those produced by Hassenboehler's '482.are morphologically significantly different.

It has also been demonstrated in Ward's US Patent 6,051,177.

The applicant understands that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C. 1001) and may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon. The Applicant declares that all statements are made of the declarant's own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true. (Per 37CFR 1.68)

Very respectfully,

Signature: 

Print Name: Gregory F. Ward Date: 9/29/03

Commercial Success Considerations

Applicant claims commercial success as showing that product webs of the instant Application are different than Hassenboehler. Product webs of the instant Application have been produced in Taiwan and sold in Asia since 1996 and the United States since 7/2002 whereas to the best of my knowledge there have been no commercial applications of the Hassenboehler process or its web products even though Licensing of it has been aggressively marketed by the University of Tennessee Research Corporation since 1993. This fact is attested to by the following Declaration and (1) a copy of the License's first and last pages (Exhibit A, attached) and (21) a copy of a secod License's first and last pages (Exhibit B), attached under which the product is manufactured in Asia as well as a sample of product literature showing a product made using the web which is the subject of the instant application.

DECLARATION OF GREGORY F. WARD

Applicant submits the following Declaration declaring that product web has been commercially manufactured in Taiwan and sold continuously since 1996 in Taiwan, China, Korea, Japan and Vietnam as well as other East Asian Countries and the United States.

The applicant understands that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C. 1001) and may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon. The Applicant declares that all statements are made of the declarant's own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true. (Per 37 CFR 1.68)

Very respectfully,

Signature: _____

Print Name: Gregory F. Ward Date: 9/29/03

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the claims are now in proper form, and the claims all define patentability over the prior art and are not obvious with respect to prior art. I believe that this application is now in condition for allowance which action I respectfully solicit.

Conditional request for Constructive Assistance

If for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicants respectfully request the constructive assistance of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 706.03(d) and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,

Gregory F. Ward, Applicant Pro Se
11115 Rotherick Drive
Alpharetta, GA 30202

Exhibit A

Applicant	Ward, Gregory F.
Serial No.	09/532,395 Divisional of 08/613,336 Parent now Patent 6,051,177
Filed:	03/22/2000
For:	Thermo-Mechanical Modification Of Nonwoven Webs
Art Unit:	1771
Examiner:	Pratt, Christopher C.

Attachment

LICENSE AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, INC.

AND

FLEXUS SPECIALTY NONWOVENS, LTD. (PHOENIX SPECIALTY NONWOVENS, LTD.)

This **LICENSE AGREEMENT** effective the 26th day of March, 1996 is by and between Advanced Technology Development, Inc., hereinafter referred to as **ATD**, a Delaware corporation with offices at 407 Montrose Parkway, Norcross, GA, USA and Flexus Specialty Nonwovens, Ltd.(Phoenix Specialty Nonwovens, Ltd.), hereinafter referred to as **FSN**, a Taiwan limited liability company and subsidiary of Nan Ya Plastics Corporation, with offices at Room 601, Ming Chi Building, No. 54, Ming Sheng East Rd., Taipei, Taiwan.

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, ATD possesses certain proprietary technology, and process and product know-how regarding the production of unique nonwoven webs exhibiting improved softness, conformability, and a high degree of commercially valuable elasticity from precursor webs containing thermoplastic fibers or blends of thermoplastic fibers and non-thermoplastic fibers, hereinafter referred to as "Licensed Web Products" resulting in a patent application entitled "Thermomechanical Modification of Nonwoven Webs" all of which is collectively referred to hereinafter as the "**ATD** Core Technology", and

WHEREAS, ATD has licensed **FSN** to manufacture, use and sell products made using the **ATD** Core Technology on a temporary and interim basis; and

WHEREAS, ATD is willing to grant **FSN**, in its new status as a Nan Ya subsidiary, a permanent, worldwide, exclusive, non-transferable license subject to the provisions of this agreement, with the right to sublicense under its technical information and patent rights relating to the said **ATD** Core Technology; and

8.2 **FSN** shall, at its own expense, be responsible for applying and obtaining any approvals, authorizations, or validations required by under the laws of the United States of America, Taiwan or any other foreign country that may be necessary for the manufacture use and sale of Licensed products or relative to the performance of any obligation under this Agreement.

8.3 The terms and conditions herein constitute the entire agreement between the parties and shall supersede all previous agreements, either oral or written, between the parties hereto with respect to the subject mater hereof. No agreement on understanding bearing on this License Agreement shall be binding on the other party hereto unless it shall be in writing and signed by a duly authorized officer of each of the parties and shall expressly refer to this License Agreement.

Executed as of the date first above written.

BY ATD

Name: _____
(Signature)

Name: GREGORY F. WARD
(Printed)

Title: PRESIDENT

Date: AUGUST 23, 1996

BY FSN

Name: _____
(Signature)

Name: DE-SHENG TSAI
(Printed)

Title: PRESIDENT

Date: Aug. 16, 1996

Exhibit B

Applicant	Ward, Gregory F.
Serial No.	09/532,395 Divisional of 08/613,336 Parent now Patent 6,051,177
Filed:	03/22/2000
For:	Thermo-Mechanical Modification Of Nonwoven Webs
Art Unit:	1771
Examiner:	Pratt, Christopher C.

LICENSE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
PHOENIX GROUP USA, INC.
AND
GOLDEN PHOENIX FIBERWEBS, INC.

This LICENSE AGREEMENT ("Agreement") as effective on the 1ST day of AUG, 2003 ("Effective Date") is entered into by and between Phoenix Group USA, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "PGUSA"), a Delaware corporation with office at 11115 Rotherick Drive, GA, USA, and Golden Phoenix Fiberwebs, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "GPF"), a R.O.C. corporation, with office at 6 FL, no. 174, Sec.2, Min Sheng E. Road, Taipei, Taiwan, R.O.C.

WITNESSTH

WHEREAS, GPF wishes to obtain and PGUSA agrees to grant GPF a non-transferable, exclusive and irrevocable right and license to utilize the PGUSA Core Technologies to manufacture, supply, distribute and sell the Licensed Web Products in the territories as set forth in Section 2 below.

NOW, THEREFORE, and in consideration of the premises, the parties hereby agree to the following terms and conditions:

1. DEFINITIONS

1.1 **PGUSA** shall mean the owner of the titles and rights of the PGUSA Core Technologies. Gregory F. Ward, the inventor and sole owner of the PGUSA Core Technologies, formed Phoenix Group USA, Inc. in 1992. Gregory F. Ward is the sole owner of Advanced Technology Development Inc (ATD). Gregory F. Ward has granted the full licensing right of the issued patents and future patents to PGUSA.

1.2 **PGUSA Core Technologies** shall mean the proprietary technology, and process and product know-how including patents entitled "Thermo-mechanical Modification of Nonwoven Webs" under US patent No. 6,051,177, was granted to Gregory F. Ward; the pending patent under US application 9/532,395, pending for Gregory F. Ward; any patent or pending patent owned by Mr. Gregory F. Ward related to above said patents or technologies relating to the production of unique nonwoven webs exhibiting improved softness, conformability, and a high degree

Executed as of the date first above written.

PHOENIX GROUP USA,

By: _____

Name: Gregory F. Ward
(Printed)

Title: Chairman and CEO
(Printed)

Date: 7/30/03

x Kyle Pratt

KYLE PRATT
Notary Public, Fulton County, Georgia
My Commission Expires Oct. 3, 2006

GOLDEN PHOENIX FIBERWEBS, INC.

By: Kenneth Jeng

Name: Kenneth Jeng (CHENG, YUAN-LONG)
(Printed)

Title: Chairman
(Printed)

Date: July. 21. 2003

In Witnesses:

By: D.H. Gilstrap

Name: DAVID GILSTRAP
(Printed)

Date: 7-21-03

By: Shirley Louie

Name: SHIRLEY LOUIE
(Printed)

Date: 7-21-03

案號 Case No.: 114033 日期 Date: JUL 21 2003
本文件全程與葉(股)公司 之簽名或蓋章，於台灣台北地方法院所屬民間公證人陳幼麟事務所認證。 公證人 陳 幼 麟
Attested at the Chen, Yu-Lin Notary Public Office of Taiwan Taipei District Court, R.O.C., that the signature(s)/seal(s) of GOLDEN PHOENIX FIBERWEBS INC. in this document is/are authentic.

Notary Public

Chen, Yu-Lin